AN INDIVIDUALIZED PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR ACADEMIC STAFF AT PENINSULA TECHNIKON

by

STANFORD EBRAIM CRONJÉ

Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Education

at the

University of Stellenbosch

Study Leader: Prof C.A. Kapp

March 2001

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

SUMMARY

Higher education depends heavily on government funding, yet the tendency in both industrial and developing countries is one towards a decrease in budget allocation for the maintenance or improvement of higher education. At the same time institutions of higher learning are increasingly required to give account of that performance.

Higher Education institutions will have to explore avenues of raising revenue other than government funding. Decisions with regard to promotion and salary increases, which form a substantial part of the expenditure on the institutional budget, must therefore be based on justifiable grounds if these institutions are to remain viable. It is for this reason that performance appraisal of academic staff assumes increasing significance.

This study addresses the aspect of introducing an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff. The research is in the format of a literature review of performance appraisal in higher education followed by a questionnaire survey and interviews among academic staff at an institution of higher learning.

The questionnaire survey and interviews prove that performance appraisal for academic staff is necessary. According to the interviews there is, however, not substantive support for an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff. In view of the support for performance appraisal elicited by the questionnaire survey, however, the research recommends that an individualised performance appraisal system be introduced for academic staff on an experimental basis, and that the research goal be subjected to further research in a more extensive manner by taking a bigger sample and employing different research methods.

OPSOMMING

Die hedendaagse tendens in hoër onderwys dui op 'n vermindering van finansiële ondersteuning deur die owerheid aan instellings vir hoër onderwys, ten spyte daarvan dat sodanige instellings hoofsaaklik aangewese is op die owerheid vir befondsing vir die handhawing, of selfs verbetering, van hoër onderwys. Terselfdertyd word daar groter verantwoording van instellings vir hoër onderwys vereis.

Instellings van hoër onderwys sal ernstige oorweging daaraan moet skenk om ander inkomstebronne as staatsbefondsing te bekom, ten einde die befondsing deur die owerheid aan te vul. Bevordering en salarisverhogings vorm 'n groot deel van die uitgawes op die begroting van die instelling. Besluite in hierdie verband behoort derhalwe geneem te word op gesonde grondslae. Dit is om hierdie rede dat prestasieboordeling van doserende personeel toenemende belangrikheid aanneem.

Hierdie navorsing fokus op die instelling van 'n geïndividualiseerde prestasiebeoordelingstelsel vir doserende personeel.

Die navorsing is in die formaat van 'n literatuurstudie van prestasiebeoordeling in hoër onderwys, gevolg deur 'n vraelysondersoek en onderhoude met doserende personeel by 'n instelling vir hoër onderwys.

Die vraelysondersoek en onderhoude bewys dat prestasiebeoordeling van doserende personeel wel nodig is. Daar is egter, volgens die onderhoude, onvoldoende steun vir 'n geïndividualiseerde stelsel van prestasiebeoordeling vir doserende personeel. In die lig van die ondersteuning vir prestasiebeoordeling soos blyk uit die vraelysondersoek, beveel die navorsing aan die instelling van 'n geïndividualiseerde prestasiebeoordelingstelsel vir doserende personeel op 'n proefbasis, en dat meer intensiewe navorsing ten opsigte van die navorsingsdoelwit gedoen word deur 'n groter steekproef te neem en verskillende navorsingsmetodes te gebruik.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I sincerely wish to thank the following people:

- Professor Chris Kapp, my study leader for his very professional guidance throughout this empowering learning curve. His frank, yet constructive criticism served as a source of inspiration.
- My employer, Peninsula Technikon, for providing financial support and encouragement in the research project.
- Daphne Morrison and Loretta Adonis, secretaries at Peninsula Technikon, for enduring my constant requests for formatting and printing of texts.
- My wife, Naomi, children Wendy, Tanya, Ashley and Bryan for their understanding and my parents Leah and Thomas for their encouragement.
- The Almighty for giving me the strength and courage of pursuing what at first seemed impossible.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my late grandparents, Samuel and Leah Cronjé, with whom I grew up and who have been the inspiration behind my decision to study further. Also to my aunt, Clarene Remas, affectionately known as "Ma Liel" for acting as my mother during my childhood years.

AN INDIVIDUALISED PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR ACADEMIC STAFF AT PENINSULA TECHNIKON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTORY PERSPECTIVE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly competitive world there is a need for institutions to utilise available resources optimally with the view to survive. Government institutions traditionally could rely on public funds for pursuing their objectives. Institutions of higher learning, which form part of such government institutions, could go about their activities with relative assurance that government would finance them at least in those activities engaged in the previous financial year. This scenario has changed substantially through developments that will be explained in the subsequent paragraphs.

Many reasons could be offered to explain this situation in higher education today, yet the following are presented as significant parameters of the current trends in higher education. This change of events will be highlighted with reference to the international, national and institutional context of higher education. These factors are not mutually exclusive and are distinguished from each other for the purpose of academic reasoning to identify the areas of major focus. They cannot be separated from each other since they are inextricably linked.

1.1. INTERNATIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING HIGHER EDUCATION

In the international context it appears that higher education is in a general crisis. In this regard Simkins (1992:3) states that internationally governments are legislating major programs of educational reform. Such reform refers to substantial and systematic attempts to change the content, structure and power relations in the educational system to achieve educational improvement. He further asserts that there are two essential preconditions for reform namely, a strongly held view within government that something is wrong with education, and a degree of consensus among the stakeholders in legislation about possible solutions. The factors that reflect the general crisis are as follows:

Firstly, whilst higher education depends heavily on government funding, the tendency in both industrial and developing countries is one towards a decrease in budget allocations for the maintenance or improvement of the quality of higher education. The developing countries experience the crisis more severe than industrialised countries due to the difficulty in containing the demand for expansion of enrolment. (World Bank, 1994:2) This phenomenon appears to be a logical result of the prognosis of low economic growth where a scarcity of employment opportunities exerts pressure on educational institutions to accommodate larger numbers of students, the result of which was a reduction in government expenditure per student.
Breneman and Finney (1997:55) state that changes in the financing of higher education in the 1990s have gradually shifted the burden from the state to the individual. For this reason many public higher education institutions are adopting strategies similar to private institutions in raising revenues. They suggest that the state and institutional leaders need to start grappling with the effects of the changes in financing in order to fully understand the changes that are still to come

Furthermore, in most developing countries enrolment increased by an average of 6% in low- and lower-middle-income groups and by 7% in upper-middle-income groups. Helped along by government subsidisation, this increase could not be fiscally sustained and led to a rapid decline in quality. Also, higher education generally remains elitist despite the fact that higher enrolment figures led to better access for women and less privileged students from rural areas. (World Bank, 1994:2)

Secondly, many institutions of higher learning still use their resources ineffectively and inefficiently. This phenomenon is characterised by low student-staff ratios, under-utilised facilities, duplicative programme offerings, high drop-out rates, and a high percentage on non-educational expenditures such as, inter alia, subsidies on student housing, food and recreation. In this regard higher education should not enjoy highest priority on public resources where they have not achieved adequate access, equity and quality at both the primary and secondary levels (World Bank, 1994:3). The above emphasises the importance of quality in higher education.

Thirdly, institutions of higher learning, along with increased autonomy, must be held accountable for performance. This would entail checking the quality of their training and research outputs, the relevance of programmes, and how they use public funds. In this regard it is important to have performance indicators in place, which are connected to institutional goals (World Bank, 1994:65).

The accountability requirement is supported by Simkins (1992:9) who asserts that educational organisations should be placed firmly within a context of political accountability through representative government. The reason for this is that education in the public sector is a real concern of the political process and of the representative bodies established to express the public interest. he asserts that the impact of changing practices on instructional staff was clearly illustrated by the fact that colleges and universities, acting as institutions of higher learning, were held accountable for academic performance. This was done by legislatures that were responsible for funding taking a keen interest in determining how academic staff were allocating their time, and governing councils/boards scrutinised the activities of academic staff. The question now arises how these international trends impact upon the national level.

1.2. NATIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING HIGHER EDUCATION

On the national level, the ministry of education has identified a number of principles to guide the process of transformation (Department of Education, 1996:5-7). A brief explanation of these is given below.

1.2.1. REDRESS

This is a mechanism to achieve equity in a higher education system that is characterised by injustices and inequalities. The education policies of the previous political order excluded certain ethnic groups from educational opportunities, and distributed resources unequally.

This situation needs to be redressed. It concerns not only abolishing unjust practices, as mentioned, but also empowerment to effect equality of opportunity to all.

1.2.2. DEMOCRATISATION

This principle requires participation in decision making either direct or through representation, and that the process of making decisions be transparent. Decision makers also need to be accountable for the way they perform their duties and in the use of resources.

1.2.3. DEVELOPMENT

As a tool for realising the socio-economic and cultural potential of the country, higher education should be targeted at attaining a balanced development of material and human resources.

1.2.4. QUALITY

This principle presupposes maintaining and applying academic and educational standards, both in terms of specific expectations and requirements to be complied with, and in the sense of ideals of excellence that should be strived at. This demands evaluating services and products against predetermined standards with a view to improvement, renewal or progress.

1.2.5. EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

An effective institution operates in a way that assures the attainment of desired outcomes. It does the correct within a given framework. An efficient institution attempts to work well without unnecessary duplication within the parameters of affordability and sustainability. It performs things correctly through optimal use of available resources. An effective and efficient institution, therefore, does the correct things in the correct manner.

1.2.6. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

Academic freedom refers to the absence of interference in the academic work, while institutional autonomy refers to the degree of self-regulation and managerial independence in fulfilling academic tasks. The extent to which an institution of higher learning would be able to preserve these liberties would logically depend on the measure of its meeting the predetermined objectives.

1.2.7. PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

This principle has a bearing on two major aspects, namely, decision making and expenditure. Firstly, institutions are required to show responsible actions to their constituency. Secondly, institutions that are funded by public funds should be able to report on the manner of spending such funds. The scenarios on national level raises the question of how these principles affect the priorities for institutions.

1.3. INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING HIGHER EDUCATION

In view of the hegemony that the ministry of education has over all national institutions of higher learning, it could be concluded that the principles applicable on the national level are without exception applicable to all institutions of higher learning. One could however, classify all the national principles into three groups for the purpose of performance appraisal of academic staff. In this regard Brink and Calitz (1994:2) state that various investigations into the objectives and nature of performance appraisal of academic staff at institutions of higher learning have identified the following most important reasons for the increasing interest in performance appraisal:

1.3.1. THE DECREASE IN GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

This development is in coherence with the international tendency to reduce government expenditure on higher education. In this regard, Vroeijenstein (1995:3) asserts that governments used to be prescriptive in developing higher education. The rationale was that detailed regulations would make such developments possible. Two significant developments, however, led to a new approach by government. Firstly, government was striving to increase student enrolment. Secondly, government reduced its investment in higher education. These contradictory developments led to the government having to reduce central control and providing more autonomy to higher education institutions on then one hand and demanding quality assurance on the other. The implication for higher education institutions is that they must now do more with less money. The only feasible way this could be attained is for higher education institutions to manage themselves like businesses. In this regard, the situation at South African institutions of higher learning shows a marked resemblance to American institutions who, in the 1980s " ... went further than mere fundraising methods and became builders, landlords, and investors ... in a daring effort to raise needed cash." Seldin (1984:11).

Since autonomy of institutions of higher learning is also prevalent in South Africa, this scenario is as applicable to the South African context. Section 40 of the Higher Education Act, 1997 (Republic of South Africa Act 101 of 1997) makes provision for institutional funds to consist of, inter alia, money raised by the institution, money raised by loans, income received for services rendered to any other entity, and other receipts from whatever source. This method of accruing funds shows a marked resemblance to methods employed by business concerns. It is also in stark contrast to the method employed by the government prior to granting autonomy to public higher education institutions, which consisted mainly of funding through government subsidies.

1.3.2. THE INCREASING INPUT OF PERSONNEL IN PERSONNEL MATTERS

This development could be attributed to the growth of trade unionism in almost all sectors of the labour market. Although it is not the intention of this study to explain the intricacies of worker involvement in higher education, it serves to be mentioned that the Higher Education Act, 1997 (Republic of South Africa Act 101 of 1997) states that there should be an institutional forum at a public higher education institution, whose duty it is to, amongst others, advise the council on issues relating to gender equity policies, the selection of candidates for senior management positions, and the fostering of an institutional culture promoting tolerance and respect for human rights, and creating an environment conducive for teaching, research, and learning. Of particular importance is the stipulation that makes provision for academic employees to serve on the institutional forum.

1.3.3. THE INCREASED DEMAND BY INTEREST GROUPS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

In this regard the pressure for accountability by the ministry of education is supported by Astin (1993:2) where it is stated that " ... there is a rapidly growing interest among federal and state policy makers in improved outcomes assessment and accountability in post-secondary education". Since the South African constitution displays many characteristics of the federalist system of government, this statement is as applicable in the South African context. As has been mentioned in paragraph 1.3.1, the granting of autonomy has come with a price in the form of improved outcomes and accountability.

Vroeijenstein (1995:11) emphasises the fact that " society demands value for money". As a result the institutions should give account of how money was spent. This development must be seen in view of the reduction in government expenditure, which demands in return a bigger financial contribution from parents in financing their children's studies. The accountability factor is entrenched by the Higher Education Act, 1997 (Republic of South Africa Act 101 of 1997) where section 26(2)(e) to (g) makes provision for representation on institutional governance structures of a student's representative council, an institutional forum, and other structures determined by the institution. In addition, section 8(2) of the said Act provides that the composition of the council of Higher Education which is purported to advise the Minister on any aspect of higher education, includes, amongst others, members who appreciate the role of higher education in reconstruction and development in terms of the stipulations of the Constitution of South African, and those who have known and shown proof of their commitment to the interests of higher education. In addition, this section provides for representivity on the grounds of race and disability, and women and men.
These developments have resulted in institutions of higher learning displaying a more critical approach to the utilisation of resources and the institution's ability to measure its performance, including the performance of staff.

In view of the technikon's mission statement of providing career education, the question refers to the design and implementation of an individualized system of performance appraisal for academic staff at Peninsula Technikon.

1.4. PROBLEM STATEMENT

There appears to be much dissatisfaction amongst academic staff about the application of performance appraisal at Peninsula Technikon. There is a strong feeling that performance appraisal is applied in a haphazard manner, and enjoys attention mainly when a decision has to be taken regarding a staff member's fitness for promotion. In view of the serious challenges facing higher education in South Africa today, a more serious approach is needed towards performance appraisal of academic staff.

1.5. THE RESEARCH GOAL

In view of the dissatisfaction that prevails amongst academic staff regarding the application of performance appraisal, the research goal is introducing a performance appraisal system at Peninsula Technikon that is individualised in that it reflects on those qualities that are most appropriate to each individual academic staff member and the attainment of institutional objectives.

1.6. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The objectives of the research are to determine:

- the need and purpose of performance appraisal;
- performance appraisal criteria;
- performance appraisal information sources;
- performance appraisal methods; and
- a performance appraisal programme.

The above objectives are not mutually exclusive, but impact on one another.

1.7. AN OVERVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Borg (1987:85) states that a research goal "should be grounded in theory or previous research". In this regard it is appropriate that the findings of previous research on performance appraisal of academic staff at institutions of higher learning be looked at. Seldin (1984:15) states that one of the most serious problems in promotion decisions at institutions of higher learning is that such decisions are not always taken on the basis of objective evidence, and that politics and personality tend to play a role.

Astin (1985:62) states that the appraisal of academic staff presents difficulties in that their competence is judged when they apply for management positions, and their performance is examined for purposes of internal promotion and tenure.

Ramsden (1992:228) found that most academic staff members in higher education perceive performance appraisal as a restrictive and time-wasting procedure that is also punitive in character. Many feel threatened and perceive most appraisal systems not to have an adequate understanding of the essentials of teaching.

Bitzer (1987:69) found that the aim of academic staff appraisal is noble in that it strives towards increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of tertiary education, and to serve as a basis for the development and rewarding of academic staff. This aim is, however, sabotaged by the manner in which the process is implemented.

Brink and Calitz (1994:2) found that performance appraisal of lecturers at technikons (in South Africa) is generally considered to be ineffective and most lecturers do not accept it.

It is in view of the above findings that the research goal was defined.

1.8. DELIMITATION OF THE RESEARCH

The research is limited to the investigation of introducing an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff performance appraisal of academic staff at the Peninsula

Technikon. The focus is on the purpose of such an appraisal system, the criteria to apply, the different sources of information, the different methods, and the responsibility of the staff member, management and the human resource department in the implementation of the appraisal process.

1.9. LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The most serious limitation of the study is the concern that the sample population might not be representative of the target population in terms of race, gender, age, rank, qualifications, and the three faculties from which the sample was drawn. It is for this reason that the issue of race was not included in the questionnaire, since the African group is very small compared to others. The researcher made use of mainly the descriptive method of research through the use of a questionnaire survey and interviews. The questionnaire comprised closed-ended questions, which limited responses of participants to specific statements on aspects discussed in the literature review. In the construction of the questionnaire the researcher was also cautious about asking leading questions that might steer the responses to what the researcher wanted to prove. This aspect was validated by subjecting the draft questionnaire to a pilot run which produced various suggestions for improving the quality of questions. In view of the reluctance of respondents to complete questionnaires, the questionnaire might not have been the best method to use under the circumstances. Interviews were conducted with only 15 respondents from the sample population of 90, which could have limited the quality of the findings.

1.10. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The research might produce information that was hitherto not known to the people who are managing performance appraisal at Peninsula Technikon. The research results might enable Peninsula Technikon to approve the introduction of a system of performance appraisal that would obviate much of the dissatisfaction among academic staff and promote the achievement of institutional objectives that are becoming increasingly demanding as a result of rapidly changing circumstances in the field of higher education

If the findings by Blackburn and Pitney (1988:21) which state that "... to be effective and fair, performance appraisal has to be individualised ...", can now be supported by a further study, management would have a mandate to design and implement an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff.

1.11. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The descriptive method of research will be used in this project. Born (1987:154) states that descriptive research is aimed at describing the characteristics of subjects of the science. He explains that much of the early work in a new science is descriptive since there is a need to know something about content of our subject before attempting to study more complex research issues. In view of the complexity of human beings and the fact that social sciences are relatively new, the descriptive approach is important in education.

1.11.1 CONCEPTUALISATION

A literature review based on performance appraisal in higher education was presented. Such information took cognisance of the results of previous research on the topic.

1.11.2. OPERATIONALISATION

Borg (1987:155) states that in education most descriptive research can be roughly classified as either survey research or observational research. This study applied survey research, which typically uses questionnaires and interviews in order to elicit opinions, attitudes, preferences and perceptions from specified people of interest to the researcher.

1.11.2(a) QUESTIONNAIRE

An instrument was needed to collect information on the opinions of academic staff members on the research problem. Since it was be too laborious and time-consuming to interview the entire sample population, a questionnaire was be used to collect the required information. The questionnaire was constructed in the following manner:

- in closed form, permitting only specified responses;

- different topics in the questionnaire will be grouped to facilitate reporting on responses;
- simple, clear language will be used;
- assumptions would fit the reality of life;
- consistency of questions will be checked;
- anonymity of the respondent will be guaranteed;
- the respondent will be informed of the results of the study ; and
- a covering letter will accompany the questionnaire.

The questionnaire had to be constructed and distributed to the target population primarily by means of hand delivery since the participants were in close proximity to the researcher's headquarters. In the event of participants' being on leave, courier service on own cost would be used. The date of submission of the questionnaire would be indicated on the covering letter. Efforts are also in place to follow up questionnaires that are not submitted by the due date. Letters of reminding would be send out about two weeks before the due date. This will be followed up by telephonic reminders immediately after letters had been mailed.

1.11.2(b) INTERVIEWS

With a view to maintaining the objectivity, reliability, and validity of the research project, it is important that there is correspondence between the items in the questionnaire and the items covered in the interview. It is for this reason that interviews should preferably be structured, where the respondents are asked the same questions in the same order. (Leedy,1997:199; O'Sullivan & Rassel, 1989:189). The structured interview was administered in the following manner:

- arrange for the interview by indicating a preferred time and send the interview questionnaire with the letter requesting the interview;
- explain the purpose of the interview;
- ask questions;
- handle incomplete and inappropriate answers;
- record answers; and
- deal with interpersonal answers.

The information collected by means of interviewing will supplemented the data collected from the questionnaire survey and improve the validity, objectivity and reliability of the findings. This brings us to the question of from whom the data was to be collected. Collecting the data from every person in the field turned out to be an almost impossible task given the research goal and the available time. This required the drawing of a sample.

1.11.3. SAMPLING

O'Sullivan and Rassel (1989:106-107) state that " ... drawing sample is an economical and effective way to learn ...". They elaborate by providing detail as to the understanding on the terminology. They describe a sample as a subset of units selected from a larger set of the same units. For example, if the opinions of over 1 million people have to be described, 100 or fewer people would be used as samples. It is necessary to gain some clarity on certain terms in order to understand the significance of sampling. These terms refer to population and sample population.

The population refers to the total set of units in which the researcher is interested. It is the larger set from which the sample is drawn. It may consist of people or things.

The target population must be defined in such a manner that they conform to the requirements of the study. For example, if the target population is all those that work as academics at institutions of higher learning, the rest of the population has to be excluded. Once this has been done, the real difficult task is the drawing of a sample from the target population. The sample to be used will depend on the research goal. Without going into the details of the different sampling designs, the researcher will elaborate on the design that suits the research goal in this study.

The sample design that will suit the research goal would be that of stratified random sampling. O'Sullivan and Rassel (1989:113) state that this design ensures that a sample adequately represents selected groups in the population, since the researcher has a knowledge of the population. The first step is to classify the population into various categories as, inter alia, race, social strata, and institutional affiliation. Separate random samples are then drawn from each stratum. In view of the research goal, the classification would be based on institutional affiliation, or faculty in this case, rank and gender of academic staff at the Peninsula Technikon. The sample for this study was a stratified random sample of 90 out of a population of 240. A selection of 30 participants from each faculty was made to ensure representativeness of the sample.

1.11.4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Leedy (1997:131) offers the following basic guidelines for handling data:

1.11.4(a) RESTATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH GOAL

The research goal is to investigate the introduction of an individualised performance appraisal system at Peninsula Technikon.

1.11.4(b) THE DATA NEEDED

The data needed are the responses from academic staff members at Peninsula Technikon.

1.11.4 (c) WHERE THE DATA ARE LOCATED

The data are located in sections B to F of the questionnaire " Performance Appraisal for Academic Personnel".

1.11.4(d) HOW THE DATA WILL BE SECURED

The data will be secured by the tabulation of the responses of the sample group to the questions on the questionnaire.

1.11.4(e) HOW THE DATA WILL BE INTERPRETED

Based on the responses to the questions, a table will be drawn up indicating respondents' perceptions of the different critical elements and the percentage of these perceptions to the total response to each critical element, for example:

Critical element	**Perception**	**Percentage**
Performance appraisal is necessary	Agree	70%

1.12. CLARIFICATION OF TERMS

In this study the following terms hereunder will acquire the meaning as indicated.

1.12.1. PERFORMANCE

This refers to how the person executes the requirements of the job. In other words, is the execution good or bad. It refers to the goals to be achieved. (French, 1987:188) It includes feedback on how improvement can be facilitated. (Gerber, Nel and Van Dyk, 1998:172). In this regard Armstrong (1996:249) mentions the aspect of feedback, which refers to providing, to the individual, information on performance.

1.12.2. STANDARDS

The concept refers to the yardsticks laid down against which actual performance can be measured. (French, 1987:188). Armstrong (1999:443) describes standards as "...standing or continuing objectives, because their essential nature may not change significantly from one review period to the next if the key task remains unaltered, although they may be modified if new circumstances arise."

1.12.3. APPRAISAL

It refers to the measurement of a person's performance in the job by means of an instrument that is reliable. French (1987:319) states that "... the concept emphasises... evaluating performance…". Some authors, especially in human resource management, prefer the concept "performance evaluation" which refers to " …the activity used to determine the extent to which an employee is performing the job effectively". It appears that even members within the same discipline disagree on the concept of appraisal. (Armstrong, 1996: 249) refers to appraisal as "measurement", which means assessing results against predetermined targets and standards.

1.12.4. ACCOUNTABILITY

Armstrong (1999:281) describes accountability as the results or outputs for which the job holder must assume responsibility and be able to answer for. The basic responsibility for performance appraisal must be with the immediate supervisors, because of their proximity to the work environment. However, the human resource department can play a significant role in the design and implementation of appraisal systems. (French,1987:339-340)

1.12.5. CRITERIA

The elements in the job which are regarded as essential for attaining prescribed performance objectives. Armstrong (1996:660) states that " the success criteria are … appropriate to the type of work carried out and the people employed on it, and …individuals are able to track performance against targets and standards throughout the period over which performance is being assessed.

1.12.6. APPRAISER

The person immediately senior to the staff member and who performs the measuring function.

1.12.7. APPRAISEE

The staff member whose work is being measured.

1.13. REFERENCE STYLE

(a) The reference system that the South African Journal for Higher Education prescribes, which is in fact related to the Harvard reference system, will be used in this study.

1.14. STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

Chapter 2 will provide some clarification of performance appraisal, its purpose, problems, appropriate criteria for measurement, methods and models, the preferred cycle and stakeholders involved in the process, and general guidelines for successful implementation of a performance appraisal system.

The research methods used will be discussed in Chapter 3, while the data analysis and interpretation will be dealt with in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will focus on the synthesis, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The reduction in government subsidies and the increase in autonomy granted to institutions of higher learning have forced the latter to explore other avenues of generating revenue, which courses to offer, as well as which staff members to promote. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the origin of performance appraisal of academic staff and how the process should be managed to address the challenges facing institutions of higher learning.

2.2. DEFINING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

It is generally accepted in any science that a meaningful discussion of a phenomenon can only be attempted once one has reached an understanding of the issue to be discussed. For this purpose it is necessary to define performance appraisal first. Many general definitions of performance appraisal are found in the literature. In view of the research goal, an attempt would be made to quote those definitions that provide a clear understanding of performance appraisal as it pertains to academic staff at institutions of higher learning.

Loder (1990:43) describes appraisal as "… a process of assessing an individual's performance over a period of time against defined criteria of acceptable performance."

French (1990:382) describes the concept as " the formal, systematic assessment of how well employees are performing their jobs in relation to established standards and the communication of that assessment to employees."

Ashcroft and Foreman-Peck (1994:40) state that " staff appraisal must be considered as a prerequisite to the effective development of all staff."
Rowland and Birkett (1992:134) emphasise the importance of appraisal as a developmental technique when they refer to it as development appraisal. They describe development appraisal as " a process where a person (appraisee) and a practised observer (appraiser) work together to assess the appraisee within the context of his or her job."
Stufflebeam (1988:5) also refers to the development aspect in appraisal when he says: " The need for sound evaluation of education personnel is clear. In order to educate students effectively and to achieve other related goals, educational institutions must use evaluation to select, retain, and develop qualified personnel and to manage and facilitate their work." The author uses the term evaluation instead of appraisal. Evaluation of staff would therefore also mean performance appraisal of staff in this study.

From the above definitions it is clear that words such as assessment, performance, standards, criteria, development, time and feedback are critical elements in the process of performance appraisal. In view of this an own definition of performance appraisal in higher education would be the assessment of job-related performance against specific criteria with a view to attaining defined objectives related to the student, staff and the institution. From this point it will be logical to investigate why institutions are interested in implementing performance appraisal.

2.3. THE PURPOSE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Staffing is a generic function in all organisations that use people to attain objectives. The purpose of performance appraisal of staff would, as a result, be comparable to many organisations.

Armstrong (1996:235), preferring the term "performance management", states that it is " ... a means of getting results from the organisation, teams and individuals by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals, standards and competence requirements. It is a process for establishing shared understanding about what is to be achieved, and an approach to managing and developing people in a way which increases the probability that it will be achieved in the short and long term".

Gerber, et al (1998:171) identify the following specific uses of performance appraisal:

- to help management decide which increases in pay should be granted on the grounds of merit;
- to determine the future utilisation of the employee;
- to indicate training needs; and
- to motivate the employee to do better in the present through providing feedback of performance.

Klingner and Nalbandian (1993:213) identify the following objectives of performance appraisal:

- communicating management objectives to employees;
- motivating employees to improve performance;
- distributing organisational rewards such as salary increases and promotions equitably; and
- conducting personnel management research.

If on-the-job performance is not satisfactory regardless of all the personnel functions having been performed accurately, there might be a need to research the source of the problem.

These general purposes can be made applicable to academic staff as well. What is needed, however, is a description of these purposes in a manner that makes them occupation specific for academic staff.

In this regard, Tucker (1984:144) states that a basic purpose is to:

- provide faculty members with some measure of how well they perform in their professional role so they can improve their performance;

- serve as a basis for decision making in matters of promotion, tenure, salary increases, and other benefits.

From the above it transpires that the success of an appraisal system could be influenced by the clarity of its purpose both to staff and management. It is in this regard that proven research results on performance appraisal could assist in identifying essential purposes of performance appraisal for academic staff at technikons. Brink and Calitz (1994:5) state that research has identified the following broad distinguishable purposes:

- staff development;
- staff retention, involving decisions on salary increases, promotion, discipline, appointment and placement; and
- identifying staff fit for promotion with a view to identifying management talent and follow-up planning.

Brink and Calitz (1994:6) stress the fact that the above purposes can be distinguished from each other, but not separated. What is further important is that these purposes are communicated clearly to academic staff in order to get their inputs and co-operation.

This study assumed that Brink and Calitz's classification is representative of the purpose of performance appraisal for academic staff. Having reached clarity on the purpose of performance appraisal, raised the question of what should be looked at in the performance of academic staff to attain the purpose of the system.

2.4. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL CRITERIA

Klingner and Nalbandian (1993:214) state that the fundamental question in performance appraisal is: " What factors should be evaluated?" They further state that there are only two basic criteria, namely person-based and performance-based criteria. Person-based systems assess an employee's personality traits, characteristics, and aptitudes. Performance-based systems measure each employee's behaviours against previously established behaviours.
Depending on the nature of the job, it may be possible that a system demands both person-based and performance-based criteria.

What is important is that any person would like to be assessed in terms of attributes that are appropriate to the situation. Hence, academic staff would like to be assessed in terms of criteria that relate to the job of lecturing.

Tucker (1984:144) states that teaching, research and service are the most important functions required at institutions of higher learning. Brink and Calitz (1994:6) stress the fact that each of the key functions will differ from institution to institution. The important determinant in this regard is the mission of the institution. At Technikon, for example, more emphasis will be placed on liaison with industry. Another important consideration is that the criteria for appraising performance are contained in that person's job description. In this regard, the mission statement also plays an important role in that different departments at the same institution could have different job descriptions for posts on the same level. Brink and Calitz address this issue by stating that each Technikon has to decide to which extent teaching effectiveness, research, service delivery and liaison with industry should be pursued, since every lecturer's performance would be evaluated in terms of these criteria. Brink and Calitz (1994:6-9) advocate the following criteria for performance appraisal of academic staff at technikons:

2.4.1 TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The responsibility of the lecturer in this regard is measured by the extent to which the following aspects are satisfactorily attended:

- planning (curricula, study objectives and course material);
- study progression (interaction and learning, controlling subject content, presentation ability, teaching media and interpersonal communication); and
- evaluation of learning progress (evaluation practices, memoranda and standards)

2.4.2 RESEARCH

This activity used to be the reserve of universities but, with the transformation of higher education, it is currently enjoying an increasing priority at technikons. The following criteria are generally applied to assess research results at technikons:

- publications, including papers in accredited and scholarly journals, authorship of textbooks and evaluating manuscripts;
- delivering papers at national and international conferences on invitation;
- funding of research. Approval by a funding body is an indication of proven standard; and
- research projects directed at problems in industry, which includes post graduate students.

2.4.3 SERVICE DELIVERY

This area refers to some form of subject service to the institution such as serving on committees, task groups, and student groups, and to the community by means of consultation, technical advice, short courses, and membership of associations.

2.4.4 LIAISON WITH INDUSTRY

In view of the mission statement of the Technikon that market-related skills should be imparted to students, liaison with industry is an important area and should be facilitated by means of:

- visits to selected industries to observe specific technology;
- industry placement, where the lecturer spends some time in the work environment to gain experience of particular technology;
- membership of professional bodies; and
- specialist and professional liaison through local and international visits to leaders in technology and industry.

2.4.5 PERSONAL QUALITIES

Although personal qualities could be confused with what is really appropriate to performance, performance appraisal also has as an objective the identification of management talent. In this regard personal qualities, strong and weak points, likes and dislikes and leadership potential play a role. The criteria can be summarised as follows:

- attitude and disposition, which refers to participation, teamwork and involvement;
- interpersonal communication, which refers to the lecturer's ability to motivate others by action, problem solving and decision making;
- creativity, which includes innovation, development and implementation of new and original methods and approaches;
- job enrichment, which deals with perseverance, initiative and responsibility; and
- administration, in the sense that general organising, meeting due dates and the implementation of policy ensure effectiveness.

Brink and Calitz (1994:9) emphasise that the above criteria are targeted not at the lecturer as a person, but at identifying and appraising those person qualities that are essential for the successful execution of the demands of the post.

The above criteria only reaffirm the necessity of a detailed job description for each staff member. Assuming that the job description will at least represent the most appropriate criteria for measuring a staff member's worth, it is now necessary to decide on the method to be used to collect information that would substantiate any finding on a person's ability to meet the agreed criteria. This can be done by deciding on the method to be employed in collecting information on performance.

2.5. THE METHODS AND SOURCES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The type and quality of information to be collected on the capability of staff members would depend greatly on the method used. There are numerous methods available to appraise performance of staff, but the selection of the method or methods would be determined by the nature of the profession under investigation. In this regard, Braskamp, Brandenburg and Ory (1984:29-33) advocate the assessment of evaluation from a variety of perspectives. They claim that multiple methods could be used in collecting information on staff competence and course quality. The most appropriate methods are ratings, written appraisals, interviews and achievement tests. In addition to these methods, is the Teaching Portfolio advocated by Seldin (1993:2). These methods rely on certain sources of information, which comprise combinations of students, colleagues, alumni, and the appraisee.
Each of these methods would now be described briefly.

2.5.1. RATING SCALES

This method can be used by both lecturers and students as source of information. In using students as a source, it includes student rating by means of rating questionnaires or surveys. (Braskamp et al. 1984:38) They claim that student ratings are the most commonly used method since they are the most effective way of collecting information from students. The three major types of student rating are:

2.5.1 (a) OMNIBUS FORM

The name "omnibus" is given to this form since the same form is given to all academic staff at the institution. According to Braskamp et al. (1984:38) this form includes major areas of instruction identified through research, and comprises the following:

- communication skill
- rapport with students
- course organisation
- student self-related accomplishments
- course difficulty, and
- grading and examinations

2.5.1 (b) GOAL-BASED FORM

This emphasises student learning in terms of gaining factual knowledge, developing special skills and developing appreciation for subject matter.

2.5.1 (c) CAFETERIA SYSTEM

Braskamp et al. (1984:38) assert that this instrument consists of a pool of items from which the lecturer can select those most appropriate for evaluating the course. It differs from the omnibus form in the sense that the lecturer has a choice among the items to select for evaluation.
When ratings are used by lecturers to evaluate colleagues, they are targeted at the following aspects:

- overall instructional competence
- teaching skills
- course structure and organisation, and
- course materials

When ratings are performed by **alumni**, they are targeted at the following:

- overall instructional competence
- teaching skills
- relationships with students
- student learning, and
- advising

When ratings are performed for **self-evaluation** purposes, they are targeted at the following:

- teaching skills
- relationships with students, and
- course structure and organisation

2.5.2. WRITTEN APPRAISALS

Braskamp et al. (1984:54) maintain that the practice of obtaining written comments from students to open-ended questions are widely used to determine strengths and weaknesses of a course and the instruction. The comment could be either about the course in general, or about specific aspects of the course and can be most useful in revising the course and teaching style.

Some general questions that could be used are:

- What are the major strengths of the lecturer?
- What do you recommend to improve the course?
- How could the lecturer improve as a teacher?
- What did you like best about the course?

When written appraisals use **colleagues** as a source, they are targeted at the following:

- overall lecturer competence;
- teaching skills;
- course structure and organisation;
- course materials;

- student learning;
- course development, and
- advising.

When **alumni** are used as a source, the target areas are:

- overall lecturer competence;
- teaching skills;
- relationship with students;
- student learning, and
- advising.

When written appraisals are used as **self-appraisal**, they are targeted at the following:

- teaching skills;
- relationship with students, and
- course structure and organisation.

2.5.3. INTERVIEWS

Interviews conducted by the lecturer's academic colleagues or professional non-academic staff members who are conversant with performance appraisal, with students can generate information about the course and the lecturer. Braskamp et al. (1984:57) state that, if handled properly, the interview can allow students to express their views freely and the interviewer can pursue topics and concerns raised in the interview. In this regard student verbal comments could be contrasted with comments in rating scales and written appraisals.

It is further suggested that interviewers use a semi-structured interview schedule. (Braskamp et al. 1984:59)

2.5.4. TESTS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Braskamp et al. (1984:60-61) state that student achievement is considered by most academic staff as the most appropriate criterion for assessing the competence of a lecturer and the attainment of course objectives, but that achievement tests are seldom used as measures of teaching competence. This is ascribed to tradition and interpretation problems. They suggest that student achievement can be useful in evaluating the instructor if test information is made interpretable. This requires a clear description of the examination procedures and philosophy adopted by the instructor.

The above methods are sometimes used in combination, and the combination to be used depends on the aspects in which management is interested.
A method of appraisal that has been enjoying vast support is that of the teaching portfolio.

2.5.5. THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO

It has been mentioned at the introduction that various forces contributed to the changed perception of teaching, especially in higher education. Among these were budgetary cuts and demands for teaching accountability by legislative and governing bodies. These forces culminated in a more serious approach to what academic staff do and their effectiveness as teachers. In view of the shortcomings that traditional methods of information collection on the performance of academic staff display, Seldin (1993:2) advocates the teaching portfolio as a method to adequately respond to the need to take teaching seriously and improve systems of teaching accountability.

2.5.5 (a) DEFINING A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

It can be described as a factual description of a lecturer's teaching strengths and accomplishments. It comprises documents and materials that indicate the scope and quality of a lecturer's teaching performance. Seldin (1993:3) emphasises that it provides hard evidence about teaching effectiveness. He cautions, however, that it does not include all documents having a bearing on teaching performance. Rather, it comprises selected information on teaching activities and proof of their effectiveness. All claims in the portfolio should be substantiated by solid empirical evidence. This raises the question of how a portfolio is created.

2.5.5 (b) CREATING A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Seldin (1993:5-6) suggests the following six steps in creating a portfolio:

(i) CLARIFY TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

This covers courses presently taught and those in the immediate past, serving as academic advisor to student bodies, and advising individual graduate and post-graduate students.

(ii) SELECT ITEMS FOR THE PORTFOLIO

Based on the teaching responsibilities, the lecturer selects items that are directly applicable to teaching responsibilities.

(iii) PREPARE STATEMENTS ON EACH ITEM

The lecturer prepares statements on activities and accomplishments on each item. Supporting documentation is also referenced.

(iv) ARRANGE THE ITEMS IN ORDER

The statements about accomplishments in each area are sequenced according to their intended use. Development workshops and seminars would, for instance, be stressed if teaching improvement is the area to be demonstrated.

(v) COMPILE THE SUPPORT DATA

Evidence substantiating the items in the portfolio should be retained by the lecturer and made available for review when requested.

(vi) INCORPORATE THE PORTFOLIO INTO THE CURRICULUM VITAE

The portfolio is then inserted into the lecturer's curriculum vitae under the heading "teaching" or "instruction".

The above appraisal methods are considered the most commonly used. Understanding which method, or combination of methods, are to be used would enable an institution to decide what the process of performance appraisal should be.

2.6. THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

When a decision is taken to implement a system of performance appraisal, it is only fair that academic staff be informed as to how the process is going to operate. Tucker (1984:151) states that the art of evaluating performance of academic staff is not well developed. Rowland and Birkett (1992:137) suggest the following programme for managing the appraisal process.

2.6.1. APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

The components of the programme are as follows:

(a) INITIAL MEETING BETWEEN APPRAISER AND APPRAISEE

The purposes of the initial meeting are to:

- confirm the purpose and clarify the context of the appraisal;
- consider the appraisee's job description;

- agree on the scope of the appraisal identifying areas of the appraisee's job on which the appraisal might usefully focus;
- agree on arrangements for self-appraisal;
- agree on arrangements for classroom observation and other methods of information collection, and
- agree on a time-table for conducting the appraisal.

(b) SELF-APPRAISAL

This aspect deals with the following considerations:

- the major tasks and responsibilities of the job;
- the parts of the job that have recently given most satisfaction, and how they could be used to best advantage;
- the parts of the job that have given least satisfaction and what may be done to alleviate this;
- problems or obstacles that prevented the achievement of goals and how to eliminate them;
- changes in the institution that would facilitate improvement of performance; and
- additional things that could be done by others targeted for the next year.

(c) CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

If classroom observation is an integral part of the appraisal process, clarity is needed on what aspects lecturers should be appraised. Rowland and Birkett (1992:137) suggest the following categories:

(i) PREPARATION

This deals with the questions of :
Was there a planned programme?
Was the aim of the activity clear?

Were adequate resources available?

Had the learning environment been considered?

(ii) TEACHING SKILLS

This deals with the following questions:

Was there a planned programme?

Was the material well presented?

Were the students involved?

Were there awareness of individuals' needs?

(iii) FOLLOW-UP

This aspect asks:

Is homework set regularly?

Is students' work marked and recorded regularly?

Do students get feedback?

Do lecturers evaluate the success of the teaching?

(d) COLLECTION OF OTHER DATA

This activity implies that the appraiser could collect data that has no direct bearing on the appraisee's job, but that can influence the appraissee's future utilisation, such as special qualifications and interests. In this regard the appraiser should:

- be familiar with national and institutional requirements for performance appraisal;
- acquire background information on the appraisee;
- have the previous appraisal statement;
- keep written submissions from other parties about the appraisee confidential;
- discuss critical comments from colleagues, management and students with the appraisee before using them;
- not put contributors under pressure, except for relevance and accuracy, and
- not use information anonymously received.

(e) THE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

It represents that stage when the findings of the initial meeting, the self-appraisal, the classroom observations and the other collected data are brought together, considered and acted upon by the appraiser and the appraisee. To achieve the most benefit from this exercise, the interview should be conducted in a venue that is interruption-free, and both parties should display a positive attitude. Both need to realise the benefits that may come from this exercise and appreciate each other's point of view.

While the discussion starts with considering the lecturer's present position, it ultimately leads to exploring future professional targets. The interview will culminate in findings and recommendations about the lecturer's performance and chances of advancement, and would be contained in an appraisal statement.

(f) PREPARATION OF THE APPRAISAL STATEMENT

Drawing up the appraisal statement remains the responsibility of the appraiser, yet it is the ideal that both parties agree as to its content. In this regard it is practice that a draft statement be drawn up by the appraiser and discussed with the appraisee during which changes can be made to produce an agreement.
Taken into consideration the fact that care had been taken in applying the appraisal system, it would be assumed that agreement between the parties would be assured. It does, however, happen that serious differences might remain after discussions.

In the event of such a situation, most appraisal schemes provide strategies to deal with them.
These can be in the form of:

- the appraisee has the right to seek intervention of the next person higher up the management hierarchy;
- the appraisee has the right to ask for a further appraisal from a different appraiser; and

- the appraisee has the right to declare a dispute with the employer in terms of labour legislation. In the South African context, the appraisee would be able to refer the dispute to the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration in terms of section 134 of the Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Republic of South Africa, 1995).

After the appraisal statement has been completed to the satisfaction of both parties, both parties sign it, and action to implement the arrangements agreed upon would commence. The statement is placed in the lecturer's personal file to which access would be restricted, normally to the appraisee, the appraiser and the person dealing with personnel matters. This brings the appraisal programme to an end, and all that remains is for management to monitor the progress in terms of the agreed upon arrangements.

With all the care taken in applying the performance appraisal system, one would expect the process to progress without any serious problems. Experience and research have, however, found that some serious problems do occur even where systems have been well designed.

2.7. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS WITH PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

It is generally accepted that systems are meant to be efficient, but that they give some problems when people have to implement them. Performance appraisal is no different from other systems, and some potential problems do occur in its application. In this regard, Gerber et al. (1998:173) identify the following potential problems with performance appraisal:

2.7.1. THE DESIGN OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The operational problems in this regard could be summarised as follows:

- poorly constructed criteria for appraisal;
- the technique is cumbersome;
- the system has more form than substance;

- criteria are based on personality characteristics and not on performance; and
- some performance appraisal techniques are not used consistently within the institution.

2.7.2. THE EVALUATOR

This aspect deals with the poor use of the performance appraisal technique by poorly trained appraisers. The various problems that could arise in this regard include:

2.7.2 (a) THE HALO EFFECT

This phenomenon appears when the appraiser bases appraisal on an overall impression, which might be positive or negative. An example would be an appraiser who believes that a lecturer, who is always smartly dressed, also maintains a high standard of work in the classroom. The appraiser therefore allows an impression on one aspect to influence assessment on other aspects as well, regardless whether there is no relation.

2.7.2 (b) PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL STANDARDS

Terms such as "good", "satisfactory" and "excellent" require closer description to ensure that the meanings used by the appraiser are understood by others unambiguously.

2.7.2 (c) THE CENTRAL TENDENCY PROBLEM

This occurs when appraiser are scared to assess too high or too low, and group their assessment around the average of the scale. They would therefore not be required to explain extreme assessments.

2.7.2 (d) STRICTNESS OR LENIENCY

The appraisal system requires objective appraisal from appraisers. It is difficult for any person to be consistently objective, as some might tend to be too strict or too lenient on aspects about which they have particular preferences or biases.

2.7.2 (e) THE RECENCY OF A PROBLEM

It is only human that appraisers would tend to remember those events that have occurred in the immediate past. These events would be fresh in their memory and influence their appraisal. A positive event could therefore favour the appraisee whilst a negative one could be to the latter's detriment.

2.7.2 (f) PERSONAL PREJUDICE

Appraisers are human and base their decisions on personal judgement, which could be biased. Personal admiration for an appraisee could thus influence the appraiser's judgement, and therefore the decision.

The above problems could jeopardise efficiency and effectiveness in work performance, and lead to employee dissatisfaction. A concerted effort should thus be made to obviate or, at least minimise, these problems. It is for this purpose that one needs to look at what is required for a successful appraisal system.

2.8. GUIDELINES FOR STARTING A SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Swanepoel et al. (1998:412-415) suggest the following basic steps for a successful appraisal system:

2.8.1. PLANNING THE SYSTEM

The critical aspects to be addressed during this phase are the following:

- Who will be involved?
- What will the main purpose be?
- How will the results be used?
- What organisational factors should be taken into account?

2.8.2. DEVELOPING THE SYSTEM

This phase seeks solutions to the following concerns:

- What is to be appraised?
- How is it to be appraised?
- Who is to appraise them?
- How often must it be appraised?
- How will the results be linked to improving, developing and rewarding performance?

In the above regard the Human Resources Department should perform the following critical activities:

2.8.2 (a) OBTAINING BASIC JOB INFORMATION

Information about job requirements could be collected from appropriate job descriptions. The Human Resources Department should provide training to subordinates and supervisors in writing job descriptions that clearly indicate the critical job information needed for performance appraisal. Klingner and Nalbandian (1993:225) support this step when stating that "job analysis and performance need to be more closely related by developing occupation specific job descriptions that include performance standards as well as duties, responsibilities and minimum qualifications".

2.8.2 (b) ESTABLISHING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Performance standards refer to conditions for satisfactory performance. They should be the result of mutual agreement and provide clarity on:

- worker output to be assessed;
- criteria for assessment; and
- how performance will be measured.

Performance criteria refer to what a person must be able to do to be successful at performing the job, for example, the lecturer must be able to draw up a syllabus for a course.

2.8.2 (c) CHOOSING THE FORMAT AND THE SOURCES OF APPRAISAL INFORMATION

This activity should also be the result of deliberation on factors such as overall objectives, potential advantages and disadvantages, and organisational circumstances.

2.8.3. IMPLEMENTING THE SYSTEM

Procedures in this phase focus mainly on training sessions for appraisers. The following aspects are important for effective appraiser training:

- the active involvement of raters in the training process;
- familiarisation with the measurement instrument;
- developing rater consensus in the interpretation of performance standards and relative levels of behaviour effectiveness;
- encouraging the recording of specific examples of behaviour;
- allowing for experiential exercises and practice;
- providing raters with feedback regarding their own rating behaviour; and
- reinforcing desirable rater behaviour through regular follow-up training.

Blackburn and Pitney (1988:18) support the idea of training of appraisers in stating that "training efforts address individuals' limited information processing capabilities as well as their susceptibility to situational distractions and personal biases".

2.9. SUMMARY

From the foregoing it appears that performance appraisal is an important personnel function that requires input from the appraissee, appraiser and the Human Resources Department to effectively attain the objectives of the system. Appraisal has to do with making a judgement on a person's performance, and since people differ in their judgement, a measure of bias can set in which could lead to some dissatisfaction amongst the appraisees. If the appraiser, however, follows the basic guidelines for effective performance appraisal, dissatisfaction can be limited.

It is important to know how the perceptions that academic personnel have of performance appraisal support its theoretical foundations and the manner in which it is applied. For this purpose empirical research is necessary. Chapter 3 provides an outline of the research design that was used.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1. INTRODUCTION

As indicated in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the descriptive method of research has been used. After a literature review based on the most recent information on performance appraisal was presented, a questionnaire was designed and distributed amongst the sample population after a pilot run was conducted. This was followed by interviews with selected academic staff members in the sample population in the three faculties at Peninsula Technikon.

3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

The descriptive method of research was used, which according to Borg (1987:155) refers to survey research or observational research. This study used survey research, using a questionnaire survey and interviews in order to elicit opinions from the specified target group. The size of the target group, which is 240 academic staff members, made it difficult to measure the opinions of everybody by interviewing each member of the group. It is for this reason that it was decided to use a sample of 90 to complete the questionnaire. Furthermore, interviews were held with 15 respondents of the sample population. The following procedure was applied:

3.2.1. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section dealt with the challenges of firstly defining the concept of performance appraisal with a view to making it especially appropriate to academic staff members.

As a result an own definition was designed which describes performance appraisal in higher education as the assessment of job-related performance and behaviour against specific criteria with a view to attaining objectives related to the student, staff and the institution.

The purpose of performance appraisal was investigated next, concluding that it should contribute to staff development, staff retention, promotion, discipline, appointment and placement, as well as identifying staff with management talent.

Performance appraisal criteria were identified as follows:

Teaching effectiveness as a criterion refers to the extent to which the lecturer is capable of planning curricula, course material and study objectives, presentation ability, interpersonal communication and the evaluation of learning progress.

Research as a criterion refers to the extent to which the staff members submits articles for publishing in accredited journals, delivering papers at national and international conferences, and involvement in research projects directed at problems in industry.

Service delivery as a criterion refers to service rendered to the institution such as serving on committees, task groups and student groups.

Liaison with industry as a criterion refers to regular visits to selected industries and industry placement for lecturers to familiarise themselves with the latest developments in practice.

Personal qualities as a criterion refer to aspects such as attitude and disposition, interpersonal communication, creativity and general administration.

The most common methods for performance appraisal were identified as rating scales, written appraisals, interviews, tests of student achievement, and the teaching portfolio. The sources of information for performance appraisal were identified as students, colleagues, head of department, alumni, and reports on activities kept in the department. These methods and sources have been discussed in detail in chapter 2 of this thesis.

The literature review concluded by suggesting a preferred sequence for implementing a performance appraisal by means of a performance appraisal programme. The information collected in the literature review would serve as a source for the design of the questionnaire to be used in collecting data from the sample population.

3.2.2. QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to collect information from the sample population, a questionnaire was used as a method of data collection.

Data collection methods have their advantages as has been identified by numerous authors, but they also have many disadvantages of which the researcher must be aware. It is in this regard that Leedy (1997:198-199) suggests guidelines for designing questionnaires with a view to obviating the disadvantages. Some of these guidelines that have been used in the design of the questionnaire used in the survey, are briefly mentioned below:

- Keep the questionnaire as short as possible.
- Organise the items so that they are easy to read and complete.
- Number the questionnaire pages and items.
- Include brief instructions printed in bold type and in upper and lower case.
- Group together items with the same content.
- Provide a rationale for the items so that the respondent understands their relevance to the study.

The questionnaire was divided into 6 categories namely, biographical information, the purpose of performance appraisal, performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal sources, performance appraisal method, and performance appraisal programme. At each section of the questionnaire an indication was given what the section dealt with, as well as the instructions to be followed, for example "This section attempts to uncover the reasons staff think that performance appraisal is necessary and which purpose it should serve. **You are required to mark with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best represents your opinion."**

A total of 33 questions were asked, which together with the subdivisions comprised 79 individual questions. The questionnaire used a rating scale with the following values for the categories of information other than biographical information:

Strongly disagree	**1**
Disagree	**2**
Unsure	**3**
Agree	**4**
Strongly agree	**5**

Although there is criticism about the inclusion of a category of "unsure" , the nature of the study deemed its inclusion necessary. In this regard it serves to mention that staff have diverse views on the issue under investigation, and there is much uncertainty amongst them. Neuman (1997:242) supports the inclusion of such a category since people are expressing opinions on issues, objects and events that may appear fictitious.

With regard to the preparation, design and mailing of the questionnaire, the practices propagated by Cohen and Manion (1989:113) were used with a view to improving the response rate of questionnaires. The authors recommend, amongst others, that the importance of the study to the audience must be stressed in the covering letter. They further suggest that direct reference be made to the confidentiality of the respondent's answers. Although they claim that the use of prestigious signatories does not affect response levels to postal questionnaires, it was mentioned in the covering letter that the study enjoyed the support of the Vice-chancellor: Academic. The rationale for this is that this person has a reputation for his commitment to striving for excellence at the institution, which might lead to a higher than normal response rate. The use of the follow-up letter to increase the response rate is another suggestion that was implemented, and it proved successful in that a number of questionnaires was received immediately after the follow-up letter was dispatched. The covering letter also contained a promise that the results of the study would be offered to the respondent, a suggestion offered by Leedy (1997:194) for improving the response rate. The questionnaire is attached as appendix A.

3.2.3. THE PILOT RUN

Before the questionnaire was distributed to respondents, it was decided to subject it to a trial run first to ensure that there are no problems with regard to the interpretation of statements. Other purposes of the pilot run were to measure the degree of difficulty of the statements, the time it took to complete the questionnaire and any suggestions for improvement. The questionnaire was delivered personally to 12 academic staff members, four from each of the three faculties. Useful suggestions for improvement were received, some of which were used to effect changes to the questionnaire. The revised questionnaire was then submitted to three of the previous respondents, one from each faculty. Small changes to the categorisation of the questionnaire were suggested, which made further testing unnecessary. It was also determined that it takes about 10 to 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. The respondents in the pilot run were generally satisfied with the content of the questionnaire and it was finally mailed.

3.2.4. SAMPLE POPULATION

The sample population comprised 90 academic staff members from a target population of 240 at Peninsula Technikon. A stratified random sample was used ensuring that the sample adequately represents selected groups in the population. (O'Sullivan and Russel, 1989:113). The first step was to classify the population into the categories of faculty, rank, and gender. The 30 participants from each faculty were then further classified into the categories of levels of seniority and gender. Random samples were then drawn from each category in relation to the number of participants in each category.

3.2.5. INTERVIEWS

It was realised that the questionnaire would not generate all the information needed to attain the research goal. The questionnaire attempted not to ask leading questions that could defeat the requirements of objectivity, reliability and validity. In order to elicit additional information and to maintain objectivity, reliability and validity, interviews were conducted with five selected respondents from each of the three faculties, taking into consideration representativeness with regard to rank, age, experience and gender. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and administered in accordance with the guidelines suggested at paragraph 1.11.2 (b) of Chapter 1 of this thesis. An interview schedule was used for recording of information, and is attached as appendix B. The interviews were intended to collect qualitative information pertaining to the feasibility of an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff at Peninsula Technikon. Respondents were asked to give reasons for their choice. The interviews gave respondents the opportunity to elaborate on issues that they could not comment on when completing the questionnaire.

3.3. SUMMARY

The research design used in the research project was that of survey research which made use of a questionnaire survey and interviews. The questionnaire was distributed to a sample population of 90 academic staff members, from which 15 were selected for interviews, 5 from each faculty to provide for representativeness. Chapter 4 deals with the analysis and interpretation of the research findings.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

As explained in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the main purpose of this research is to investigate the introduction of an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff at the Peninsula Technikon. The information could serve as a guide to Technikon management to amend existing systems of performance appraisal of academic staff.

A questionnaire with closed-ended questions was designed as a survey instrument to measure the opinions of academic staff members. The questionnaire consisted of the following sections:

Section A: Personal factors
Section B: Purpose of performance appraisal
Section C: Criteria factors
Section D: Information source factors
Section E: Method factors
Section F: Programme/Process factors

The draft questionnaire was piloted on a sample of 12. A sample of 90 was taken from a population of 240 academic staff members at Peninsula Technikon, 30 from each of the three faculties.

The total number of completed questionnaires was 35 and the response rate was 39% of the sample population. In this regard Borg (1987:110) states that if the response rate is below 70%, little confidence can be placed in the results recorded, except when there is evidence that the respondents are representative of the population from which they were drawn. The response rate, calculated as a percentage of the target population, was 14%. Since a low response could make the findings unreliable, the researcher consulted an expert in statistical analysis. Maritz (2000) is of the opinion that the low response rate could be attributed to the fact that institutions of higher learning are usually over-surveyed. He suggests that approaching a number of the participants from the sample, about 10, who did not submit the questionnaire and asking them to complete it could confirm the reliability of the research results. If their responses do not differ meaningfully from the responses of the 35 participants, the original findings can be considered reliable. The researcher undertook this exercise and succeeded in getting another 6 questionnaires completed, one from each from the Business Faculty and the Science Faculty, and 4 from the Engineering Faculty. The results from the additional questionnaires did not differ from the 35 questionnaires previously submitted. The data was processed using the SPSS statistical package. The results of the questionnaire survey are given in the same sequence as the questions appear in the questionnaire.

4.2. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data relating to the six categories mentioned above are given in the following sequence.

4.2.1. PERSONAL FACTORS

With a view to getting a better understanding of the responses from the participants in the survey, it was regarded as essential to include information on aspects that have an influence on all staff in the survey. It is for this reason that the following biographical information was asked:

(a) FACULTY

In order to interpret the results of the survey, it was necessary to know how the faculties were represented. This is reflected in table 4.1.

Table 4.1.

FACULTY

	Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Business	15	42,9	42,9	42,9
Engineering	11	31,4	31,4	74,3
Science	9	25,7	25,7	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

From table 4.1 it can be inferred that there is an adequate representation of the different faculties in the response. The highest response is 42,9% (Business), the lowest 25,7% (Science), with 31,4% (Engineering) in between.

(b) POSITION

To understand the aspirations of staff for advancement in their careers, it is important to know how far academic staff has progressed in their career paths. This is presented in table 4.2. which shows that all the ranks are represented.

Table 4.2.

POSITION

Rank	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Lecturer	15	42,9	42,9	42,9
Senior Lecturer	8	22,9	22,9	65,7
HOD	6	17,1	17,1	82,9
Associate Dean	3	8,6	8,6	91,4
Dean	3	8,6	8,6	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.2. shows that most of the respondents (42,9%) occupy the lowest rank of lecturer. It is also evident from the table that all the senior ranks within faculties were represented. It

would be these staff members that have to assume responsibility for implementation of performance appraisal.

(c) NUMBER OF YEARS SERVICE

The number of years of service a person has with the institution, and therefore also implementation of the performance appraisal system, may have a telling influence on that person's perception of performance appraisal. For this reason is was considered important to also have an idea of staff's number of years service. This is reflected in table 4.3.

Table 4.3.

NUMBER OF YEARS SERVICE

Years	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative Percent
0-5	8	22,9	22,9	22,9
6-10	11	31,4	31,4	54,3
11-15	6	17,1	17,1	71,4
16-20	9	25,7	25,7	97,1
21 and more	1	2,9	2,9	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

From table 4.3 it can be inferred that the majority of staff are in the categories 6-10 years of service (31,4%) and 16-20 years of service (25,7%).

(d) ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

The level of academic qualifications could influence a staff member's perception of performance appraisal as it could influence competitive ability and tenure. This is reflected in table 4.4.

Table 4.4.

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
M + 3	2	5,7	5,7	5,7
M + 4	11	31,4	31,4	37,1
M + 5	15	42,9	42,9	80,0
M + 6	7	20,0	20,0	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

From table 4.4 it can be concluded that most staff members (42,9%) are in possession of an M+5 qualification. A very low percentage (5,7%) possesses only M+3 which represents a diploma or degree, which are considered as equal in terms of minimum appointment requirements.

(e) GENDER

To gain an understanding of the circumstances under which staff work, it was essential to know the gender composition of the staff. This is reflected in table 4.5.

Table 4.5.

GENDER

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	12	34,3	34,3	34,3
Male	23	65,7	65,7	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

It can be inferred from table 4.5 that about a third (34,3%) of the respondents is female.

(f) AGE

A person's age, as is the case with academic qualifications, could influence perception about performance appraisal. An older person might be less interested in the process, especially when nearing the retirement age compared to a younger person who has high ambitions. This is reflected in table 4.6.

Table 4.6.

AGE

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
25 – 40 yrs	14	40,0	40,0	40,0
41 – 55 yrs	16	45,7	45,7	85,7
56 yrs and older	5	14,3	14,3	100,0
Total	35	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.6 shows an even distribution of staff members in the age group 25-40 years (40%) and the age group 41-55 years (45%), with the older staff members (56 years and older) representing 14.3%.

The responses regarding personal factors show that respondents are mostly in the age group 40 years or older, have 10 years and more service and possess an Honours degree or higher. Respondents represent all the positions from the lowest to the highest in the academic staff component. Furthermore, a third of the respondents are female.

4.2.2. THE PURPOSE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

It was deemed necessary to assess the respondents' perception of performance appraisal to understand their reaction to the purpose it should serve.

(a) NECESSITY FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The extent to which a staff member agrees that performance appraisal is necessary will influence responses on the remaining statements in the questionnaire. The response is given in table 4.7.

Table 4.7.

NECESSITY FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
Performance appraisal is necessary	Agree	94,2
	Disagree	2,9
	Unsure	2,9

From table 4.7 it can be deduced that the majority (94,2%) of respondents agree that performance appraisal is necessary.

4.2.3. THE OBJECTIVES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

In order to understand the respondents' expectations of performance appraisal it was essential that their responses be tested on its objectives. The results are given in table 4.8.

Table 4.8

THE OBJECTIVES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
Communicate management objectives to staff	Agree	63
	Disagree	26
	Unsure	11
Identify staff training needs	Agree	100
Motivate staff to improve performance	Agree	89
	Disagree	11
Help management decide on pay increases	Agree	60
	Disagree	26
	Unsure	14
Serve as basis for granting promotion	Agree	71
	Disagree	12
	Unsure	17
Guide management in administering disciplinary procedures	Agree	34
	Disagree	43
	Unsure	23
Identify management potential amongst staff	Agree	89
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	8

Table 4.8 shows that the following purposes of performance appraisal enjoyed the support from respondents as indicated below;

(a) identify staff training needs (100%)

(b) motivate staff to improve performance (89%)

(c) identify management potential amongst staff (89%)

(d) serve as a basis for granting promotion (71%)

The purpose that enjoyed least support was that of guiding management in administering disciplinary procedures.

4.2.4. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL CRITERIA

This section dealt with the factors that are considered as the norms against which academic staff should be measured. The following were identified as appropriate criteria that originate from the literature review in Chapter 2:

(a) TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS CRITERION

In order to understand the results of the survey, it was necessary to find out how respondents view the measurement of teaching effectiveness as a criterion. This is presented in table 4.9

Table 4.9

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS CRITERION

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Good pass rates	Agree Disagree Unsure	54 23 23
(ii) Good assessments of the lecturer from students in the form of questionnaire surveys	Agree Disagree Unsure	77 6 17
(iii) Available lecturing material compiled by the lecturer	Agree Disagree Unsure	69 6 25

Table 4.9 shows that respondents regard good assessments from students (77%) and availability of lecturing material materials compiled by the lecturer (69) as preferred criteria for measuring teaching effectiveness. Good pass rates are the least preferred (54%). The above criteria were identified by respondents during the pilot study as appropriate for measuring teaching effectiveness.

(b) RESEARCH CRITERION

Since research is increasingly becoming a yardstick for excellence at institutions of higher learning, it was essential to measure the respondents' perception of the extend to which research should serve as a criterion. The results are presented in table 4.10

Table 4.10

RESEARCH CRITERION

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Academic qualifications	Agree	74
	Disagree	14
	Unsure	12
(ii) Action research/current events	Agree	63
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	28
(iii) Publications in scholarly journal	Agree	36
	Disagree	24
	Unsure	40
(iv) Delivering papers at conferences	Agree	49
	Disagree	20
	Unsure	31

Table 4.10 shows that research for academic qualifications (74%) and research of current events (63%) enjoy the most support. The latter aspect refers to research in the appropriate field the lecturer operates in. The various elements listed in table 4.10 were identified by respondents during the pilot study as appropriate elements regarding research.

(c) SERVICE DELIVERY CRITERION

To understand how respondents perceive their role in activities other than lecturing in general, it was essential to find out how they rate on-the -job activities. The responses are given in table 4.11

Table 4.11

SERVICE DELIVERY CRITERION

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Committee work	Agree	37
	Disagree	34
	Unsure	29
(ii) Student consultation with the lecturer regarding studies	Agree	94
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	3
(iii) Presenting short courses	Agree	49
	Disagree	17
	Unsure	34

Table 4.11 shows that student consultation enjoys most support (94%) as a measurement of service delivery, followed by delivering short courses (49%) and committee work (37%).

(d) LIAISON WITH INDUSTRY

Since the prosperity of technikons depends increasingly on how they forge partnerships with industry, it was essential to measure respondents' perception of this criterion. The results are given in table 4.12.

Table 4.12

LIAISON WITH INDUSTRY

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Course development	Agree	91
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	6
(ii) Student experiential learning	Agree	89
	Disagree	2
	Unsure	9
(iii) Staff exchange	Agree	72
	Disagree	8
	Unsure	20
(iv) Co-operative education projects	Agree	77
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	20

Table 4.12 shows that respondents attached a high value to liaison with industry for purposes of course development (91%) and opportunities for student experiential learning (89%). Co-operative education projects (77%) and staff exchange (72%) also scored well.

(e) PERSONAL QUALITIES

Since personal commitment and talent can contribute to excellence it was essential that perceptions of the role of personal qualities be measured. The response to this question is given in table 4.13

Table 4.13

PERSONAL QUALITIES

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Participation in projects	Agree	94
	Unsure	6
(ii) Creativity/innovation	Agree	91
	Disagree	6
	Unsure	3

Table 4.13 shows that personal qualities enjoy good support amongst all respondents in terms of participation in projects (94%) and creativity (91%).

4.2.5 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SOURCES

Performance appraisal requires that a decision be taken with regard to how the appraisee performs. Such a decision can only be made if the necessary information is available. It is thus important to gain clarity as to the sources where this information could be found. Braskamp et al. (1984:29-33) identify the following sources of information needed for the purpose of performance appraisal. It is only logical that different sources of information are used to substantiate proficiency in the different elements of job requirements.

(a) STUDENTS AS INFORMATION SOURCE

The extent to which students do well in their studies could depend on how well the lecturer does his work. It is for this reason that inputs from students about a lecturer's performance is essential. The results are given in table 4.14.

Table 4.14

STUDENTS AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	97
	Disagree	3
(ii) Personal qualities	Agree	85
	Disagree	6
	Unsure	9
(iii) Service delivery	Agree	97
	Unsure	3

As can be concluded from table 4.14 students are preferred highly as source of information on the aspects of measuring teaching effectiveness and service delivery (both 97%), and personal qualities (85%).

(b) COLLEAGUES AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Academic staff frequently work together and could have a good idea of then quality of each other's work. It is for this reason that colleagues have been chosen as a source of information. The response is given in table 4.15.

Table 4.15

COLLEAGUES AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	60
	Disagree	10
	Unsure	30
(ii) Personal qualities	Agree	71
	Disagree	12
	Unsure	17
(iii) Service delivery	Agree	80
	Disagree	11
	Unsure	9

Table 4.15 shows that all three aspects of service delivery (80%), personal qualities (71%) and teaching effectiveness (60%) scored high on their suitability for appraisal by colleagues.

(c) HEAD OF DEPARTMENT AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Since there is an authority relationship between the lecturer and the head of department, and the fact that comments from other sources about the lecturer's performance could be reported to him, it was deemed essential to include the head of department as an information source. The results are shown in table 4.16.

Table 4.16

HEAD OF DEPAPARTMENT AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	89
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	8
(ii) Personal qualities	Agree	83
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	8
(iii) Service delivery	Agree	97
	Disagree	3
(iv) Research	Agree	86
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	11
(v) Liaison with industry	Agree	83
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	8

From table 4.16 it is evident that the head of department is considered as an essential and high-profile source of information on all the criteria for performance, namely service delivery (97%), teaching effectiveness (89%), research (86%), and liaison with industry and personal qualities (83%) each.

(d) ALUMNI AS INFORMATION SOURCE

The success that former students achieved in their studies could be partly the result of the contribution the lecturer made during the student's period of study. It is for this reason that alumni have been included as an information source. The response is presented in table 4.17.

Table 4.17

ALUMNI AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	54
	Disagree	17
	Unsure	29
(ii) Research	Agree	46
	Disagree	40
	Unsure	14
(iii) Service delivery	Agree	57
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	34
(iv) Liaison with industry	Agree	60
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	31
(v) Personal qualities	Agree	51
	Disagree	12
	Unsure	37

Table 4.17 shows that alumni as information source is preferred for measuring liaison with industry (60%), service delivery (57%), and teaching effectiveness (54%). It also enjoyed support as a measuring instrument for personal qualities (51%) and research (46%).

(e) REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES KEPT IN THE DEPARTMENT AS INFORMATION SOURCE

In order to measure respondents' perception on contributions made through involvement in a wide spectrum of activities, it was essential that a question be asked about the contribution that recorded evidence on files of the lecturer's performance could make. The response is presented in table 4.18

Table 4.18

REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES KEPT IN THE DEPARTMENT AS INFORMATION SOURCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Committee work	Agree	68
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	3
(ii) Materials development	Agree	83
	Disagree	11
	Unsure	6
(iii) Research	Agree	83
	Unsure	17
(iv) Service delivery	Agree	88
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	9

Table 4.18 indicates that reports are highly regarded as a source of information for appraising service delivery (88%), materials development (83%), research (83%) and committee work (68%). From the above sources of information it can be deduced that the element of service delivery scored consistently high except under alumni.

4.2.6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL METHODS

Various methods can be employed in assessing staff. The following are the most common.

(a) RATING SCALES AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

This question was asked in view of the fact that some appraisers prefer predetermined grades of performance that requires of the appraiser to indicate the grade that best describes their choice. This is reported in table 4.19.

Table 4.19

RATING SCALES AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	69
	Disagree	20
	Unsure	11
(ii) Research	Agree	46
	Disagree	20
	Unsure	34
(iii) Liaison with industry	Agree	57
	Disagree	23
	Unsure	20
(iv) Personal qualities	Agree	66
	Disagree	23
	Unsure	11

Table 4.19 shows that rating scales enjoy even support for measuring teaching effectiveness (69%) and personal qualities (66%), with lesser support for measuring liaison with industry (57%) and research (46%).

(b) WRITTEN APPRAISALS (REPORTS) AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Since some jobs have different requirements than others, which are difficult to include in rating scales, it was essential to know the perception of respondents to the use of written appraisals. In this method the supervisor is required to record comments on the performance and conduct of the staff member on a regular basis to use when the staff member has to be appraised.

Table 4.20

WRITTEN APPRAISALS AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Element	**Response**	**Percentage**
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree Disagree Unsure	86 9 5
(ii) Research	Agree Disagree Unsure	66 6 28
(iii) Personal qualities	Agree Disagree Unsure	66 9 25
(iv) Liaison with industry	Agree Disagree Unsure	63 11 26

From table 4.20 it can be deduced that that written reports enjoy most support in appraising teaching effectiveness (86%), with even support in appraising research (66%), personal qualities (66%) and liaison with industry (63%).

(c) INTERVIEWS AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

This question was asked to determine the extent to which respondents were of the opinion that interviews provide a basis for appraising performance. The response is given in table 4.21.

Table 4.21

INTERVIEWS AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Creativity	Agree	77
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	20
(ii) Personal development	Agree	66
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	31
(iii) Administrative improvement	Agree	60
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	31

Table 4.21 shows that interviews are most favoured for appraising creativity (77%), with even support for personal development (66%) and administrative improvement (60%).

(d) TESTS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Since there is widespread belief that performance appraisal should be based on proven results, it was essential to know the perception of respondents of tests of student achievement as a result of the staff member's contribution. The results appear in table 4.22.

Table 4.22

TESTS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Student results	Agree	68
	Disagree	6
	Unsure	26
(ii) Student development	Agree	83
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	14
(iii) Course development	Agree	86
	Disagree	9
	Unsure	5

Table 4.22 shows tests of achievement enjoy even support for measuring course development (86%) and student development (83%). Student results obtained 68% support.

(e) TEACHING PORTFOLIO AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Teaching portfolios represent documentary proof of a lecturer's achievements in academic activities, which provides a comprehensive measuring tool for assessing staff. It is for this reason that a question on teaching portfolio was asked. The response is given in table 4.23.

Table 4.23

TEACHING PORTFOLIO AS A METHOD OF APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching performance	Agree Disagree Unsure	88 6 6
(ii) Personal development	Agree Disagree Unsure	88 3 9

From table 4.23 it can be deduced that the teaching portfolio as a method of appraising teaching performance and personal development enjoyed equal support (88%).

4.2.7. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

As was indicated in the section dealing with related research in paragraph 1.7 of chapter 1, some of the dissatisfaction that academic staff experience with performance appraisal systems concerns the manner in which the system is implemented. Questions under this section were asked with a view to measuring respondents' perception of what the contents and process of performance appraisal should be. The questions deals with how a performance appraisal programme should start, what should be done by the various role-players, and how the programme should be concluded. These questions are dealt with under the following headings:

(a) STARTING THE PROGRAMME

This question was asked to elicit respondents' opinion of how the programme should be initiated. The response is presented in table 4.24.

Table 4.24

STARTING THE PROGRAMME

Element	Response	Percentage
The programme should start with a meeting between the appraiser and the appraisee to clarify the purpose thereof.	Agree Unsure	89 11

Table 4.24 shows that 89% of respondents agreed that the programme should start with a meeting between the appraiser and appraisee with a view to clarifying the purpose of the performance appraisal programme.

(b) SELF-APPRAISAL BY STAFF

This question was asked to assess the respondents' perception of the degree to which academic staff should appraise themselves. The response is given in table 4.25.

Table 4.25

SELF-APPRAISAL BY STAFF

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree Disagree	89 11
(ii) Research	Agree Disagree Unsure	88 3 9
(iii) Service delivery	Agree Unsure	89 11

Table 4.25 shows that there is equal support for self-appraisal concerning the measuring of teaching effectiveness (89%), service delivery (89%) and research (88%).

(c) CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

This question was asked to determine the importance attached to classroom observation as an essential step in the process of appraisal. The response is given in table 4.26.

Table 4.26

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION OF PERFORMANCE

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Teaching effectiveness	Agree	89
	Unsure	11
(ii) Personal qualities	Agree	57
	Disagree	12
	Unsure	31

Table 4.26 shows that classroom observation for measuring teaching effectiveness enjoyed strong support (89%), with average support (57%) for measuring personal qualities.

(d) APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

This question was asked to measure the response to how the appraisal result should be made known to the appraisee. The response is presented in table 4.27.

Table 4.27

APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

Element	Response	Percentage
There should be an appraisal interview for informing the appraisee of the result of the performance appraisal	Agree	83
	Disagree	3
	Unsure	14

Table 4.27 shows that 83% of respondents supported the practice that the appraisal result be made known to the appraisee during an appraisal interview.

(e) APPRAISAL STATEMENT OF RESULTS

This question was asked to measure the perception of formal procedures about the appraisal result. The response is given in table 4.28.

Table 4.28

APPRAISAL STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Element	Response	Percentage
The appraiser should prepare an appraisal statement to be filed on the appraisee's personal file	Agree	63
	Disagree	6
	Unsure	31

Table 4.28 shows that more than half of the respondents (63%) support the view that the appraiser should prepare an appraisal statement of the results of the appraisal, to be filed on the employee's personal file.

(f) FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS TO MONITOR PROGRESS

This question was asked to measure respondents' opinion on the need for maintaining continuity in the appraisal process. The results are given in table 4.29.

Table 4.29

FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS TO MONITOR PROGRESS

Element	Response	Percentage
Follow-up meetings should be arranged to monitor progress	Agree	86
	Disagree	8
	Unsure	6

Table 4.29 shows that the majority of respondents (86%) were of the opinion that follow-up meetings should be arranged to monitor progress in the appraisal process. This is especially the case where the appraisal process has found certain shortcomings in the performance and conduct of the staff member.

(g) FREQUENCY OF APPRAISAL

This question was asked to measure the opinion of respondents about how often performance appraisal should be performed. The results are given in table 4.30.

Table 4.30

FREQUENCY OF APPRAISAL

Element	Response	Percentage
(i) Every three months	Agree	26
(ii) Every six months	Agree	37
(iii) Annually	Agree	37

Table 4.30 shows that there was even support for appraisal taking place every six months (37%) and once a year (37%).

(h) SPECIAL TRAINING FOR APPRAISERS

This question was asked to measure the opinion of respondents with regard to the ability of every supervisor to execute the appraisal process, or whether specialist training in performance appraisal should be provided to every supervisor who is required to perform the appraisal process. The results are presented in table 4.31.

Table 4.31

SPECIAL TRAINING FOR APPRAISERS

Element	Response	Percentage
Special training should be given to all appraisers	Agree	100

Table 4.31 shows that 100% of respondents agreed that special training should be given to all appraisers.

4.3. THE INTERVIEWS

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a total of 15 academic staff members, 5 from each faculty randomly selected from the sample population of 90. The interview schedule is attached as appendix B.

In view of the research goal of introducing an individualised performance appraisal system at Peninsula Technikon, the respondents were asked about their preference for one of two systems of performance appraisal, namely the Omnibus system and the Cafeteria system as discussed at paragraph 2.5.1 in Chapter 2 of this thesis. The main difference between the two systems is that the Ominbus system requires that everyone be appraised according to the same criteria, whilst the Cafeteria system allows the appraisee to select from a number of criteria those most appropriate to the appraisee's strengths. The latter system supports the individualised performance appraisal system.

The response of the interviewees was in favour of an appraisal system that applies common criteria to all concerned regardless of personal qualities and interests. The most common concern interviewees expressed about an individualised performance appraisal system was that it could lead to subjectivity since appraisees can select those criteria that they are good at and discard those they experience difficulty meeting. They felt that this would lead to a lack of uniformity in appraising people that are essentially performing comparable functions.

The results of the interviews thus did not support the suggestion of an individualised performance appraisal system.

4.4. SUMMARY

This chapter has given an overview of the data analysed in the questionnaire survey and interviews based on the literature review. The data generated by the questionnaire survey was presented in the same sequence that it appeared on the questionnaire. A brief interpretation of the data was given under each of the six sections of questions dealt with in the questionnaire. An interview schedule was used to conduct semi-structured interviews with a view to eliciting additional information on respondents' opinions on introducing an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff. This was also reported on in this section. Chapter 5 deals with the synthesis, recommendations and conclusion.

CHAPTER 5

SYNTHESIS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This study was aimed at investigating the need for introducing an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff at Peninsula Technikon. This Chapter provides a summary of the findings in the form of a synthesis of the literature review and a synthesis of the questionnaire survey and interviews. It also discusses the major conclusions that were derived from the research, as well as recommendations for future research.

5.2. SYNTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH

The major findings identified in the literature review, the questionnaire survey and interviews will be discussed in this section.

5.2.1. SYNTHESIS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

From the various definitions of performance appraisal highlighted in chapter 2, the researcher concluded the concept to mean the assessment of job-related performance according to specific criteria with the aim of attaining objectives related to the student, staff and the institution. Regarding the purpose of performance appraisal, the broad purposes of staff development, staff retention and identifying staff for promotion were identified. Although performance appraisal criteria may differ from institution to institution, the criteria that have proved to be applicable to academic staff at technikons are teaching effectiveness, research, service delivery, liaison with industry, and personal qualities. The most common methods of performance appraisal are rating scales, written reports, interviews, tests of student achievement, and teaching portfolios. The essential steps necessary in managing a performance appraisal programme successfully suggest clear responsibilities for the appraisee, the appraiser and the institution. Potential problems with performance appraisal alluded to, amongst others, the design of the system, the halo effect and personal prejudice. Chapter 2 concluded with suggesting guidelines for starting a successful performance appraisal system. The next section will focus on the synthesis of the questionnaire survey and the interviews.

5.2.2. SYNTHESIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY AND INTERVIEWS

Chapter 3 discussed the research design and its implementation. In view of the high number of respondents identified for the research - a sample of 90 academic staff members from a population of 240 - it was realised that it would be difficult to interview all of them, and it was decided to make use of the questionnaire and interviews with 15 selected respondents in the sample. The response rate was 39% of the sample population, which represents 14% of the target population. The researcher was concerned about the effect that the low response rate would have on the findings, and consulted an expert in statistical analysis to address this concern. The advice that was heeded to was to survey a small group of about 10 from the sample that did not respond to the questionnaire and to compare their responses with that of the participants that responded initially. If the responses of the small group did not differ meaningfully from those that initially responded, the findings could be considered reliable.

The analysis and interpretation of the research findings were dealt with in Chapter 4. A questionnaire with closed-ended questions was designed as a survey instrument to determine the opinions of academic staff members on performance appraisal. The questionnaire consisted of the following sections:

Section A: Personal factors

Section B: Purpose of performance appraisal

Section C: Criteria factors

Section D: Information source factors

Section E: Method factors

Section F: Programme factors

Personal factors refer to biographical information of the respondents. The findings of the questionnaire survey indicated that respondents are mostly in the age group 40 years and older, have 10 years and more service and possess an Honours degree or higher. Furthermore, a third of the respondents are female. (tables 4.1. to 4.6).

Regarding the purpose of performance appraisal, the findings indicated that performance appraisal should be implemented, amongst others, to serve the following objectives:

- identify training needs;
- motivate staff to improve performance;
- identify management potential amongst staff; and
- serve as a basis for granting promotion. (table 4.8).

Respondents supported the following proposed criteria as appropriate for appraising academic staff:

- teaching effectiveness (table 4.9);
- research (table 4.10);
- service delivery (table 4.11);
- liaison with industry (table 4.12); and
- personal qualities (table 4.13).

The findings indicate that respondents consider the following performance appraisal sources as the most important. The sources are given according to the preferences of the respondents:

- head of department for all performance appraisal criteria (table 4.16);

- students for teaching effectiveness, service delivery and personal qualities (table 4.14);
- colleagues for teaching effectiveness, service delivery and personal qualities (table 4.15); and
- alumni for liaison with industry and service delivery (table 4.17).

Respondents supported the following performance appraisal methods, in order of preference:

- teaching portfolio (table 4.23);
- tests of student achievement (table 4.22);
- written appraisals/reports (table 4.20);
- interviews (table 4.21); and
- ratings scales (table 4.19).

Respondents were in agreement that there should be clear steps regarding the implementation of a performance appraisal programme, where the responsibilities of the appraisee, the appraiser and the institution are clearly defined. The responses are depicted in tables 4.24 to 4.31 but since they correspond to generic performance appraisal programmes, they are not regarded as sufficiently meaningful to report on in detail.

The interviews were intended to provide qualitative information that the closed-ended questions could not provide without asking leading questions. The information generated by the interviews showed some support for the research goal, yet there was more support for a uniform performance appraisal system for academic staff. It can therefore be asserted that the in formation generated by the interviews did not conclusively provide support for the research goal. A comparison of the literature review, the questionnaire survey and interviews provide a basis for making certain conclusions.

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

In order to ensure that the conclusions made from the literature review, and the questionnaire survey and interviews are meaningful to the reader, it is important to restate the research problem, goal and the objectives of the research.

The problem statement referred to the dissatisfaction amongst academic staff about the application of performance appraisal at Peninsula Technikon.

The research goal was to investigate the possibility of introducing a performance appraisal system that is individualised in that it reflects those qualities that are most appropriate to each individual academic staff member and the attainment of institutional objectives.

The objectives of the research as indicated in Chapter 1 (paragraph 1.6) were to:

- investigate the need for performance appraisal;
- assess opinions on performance appraisal criteria;
- assess opinions on performance appraisal information sources;
- assess opinions on performance appraisal methods; and
- assess opinions on the performance appraisal programme.

From the findings of the questionnaire survey as reported in this Chapter, most of the research objectives have been attained. Respondents indicated that performance appraisal is necessary, and that its purpose should be clearly defined. They also indicated which criteria should apply, which information sources and methods should be used, as well as how a performance appraisal system should be implemented. The interviews focussed on eliciting a direct response from participants by asking them pertinently whether they prefer an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff. Although there was a measure of support for an individualised performance appraisal system, the majority of respondents were of the opinion that academic staff should be appraised according to similar criteria.

The fact that the research objectives have been achieved raises the question whether the research goal has also been achieved. This aspect is addressed in the next paragraph.

5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

With reference to the research goal of introducing an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff at Peninsula Technikon, the questionnaire survey focussed on the issues surrounding performance appraisal in general. From the findings of the questionnaire survey it is evident that there is strong support for performance appraisal for academic staff. The objective of the interviews was to elicit participant responses by asking them pertinently whether they prefer an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff or a performance appraisal system where everyone is appraised according to similar criteria. There was some support for an individualised performance appraisal system, but the majority were of the opinion that academic staff should be appraised according to similar criteria. There is therefore no authoritative support for the research goal. However, since the sample for conducting the interviews was small, and there was no definite rejection of the individualised performance appraisal system, it is recommended that:

(a) management at Peninsula Technikon allows the various faculties to experiment with the individualised performance appraisal system for a period of 2 years; and

(b) further research on the implementation of an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff be conducted on a larger scale, using a bigger sample and a greater variety of research methods.

5.6. CONCLUSION

Higher education institutions across the world are facing increasing challenges to their future, not only from government but from interest groups as well. One the hand they are required to establish and maintain quality education, whilst on the hand government funding is decreasing. The message is therefore clear that higher education institutions must be able to attain their objectives with the limited resources that are available. This implies a commitment to efficiency and effectiveness in their activities. For this to be possible, institutions need to make quality decisions regarding their activities. This includes decisions regarding personnel, since expenditure on personnel constitutes a large portion of their budgets. This makes it essential for leaders at institutions of higher learning to have a sound foundation for making decisions pertaining to the utilisation of personnel. It is for this reason that performance appraisal of academic staff has become an important item on the agenda of management at institutions of higher learning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, M. 1996. **Handbook of Personnel Management Practice.** London: Kogan Page Ltd

Armstrong, M. 1999. **Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice.** London: Kogan Page Ltd

Ashcroft, K. and Foreman-Peck, L. 1994. **Managing Teaching and Learning in Further and Higher Education.** London: The Falmer Press

Astin, A.W. 1993. **Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education.** Phoenix: The Oryx Press

Becher, T. and Kogan M. 1980. **Process and Structure in Higher Education.** London: Heinemann Educational Books Limited

Bitzer, E.M. 1987. " Indications of Academic Staff Appraisal at Tertiary Education Institutions". **The South African Journal for Higher Education. 1** (1): 69-72

Blackburn, R.T. and Pitney, J.A. 1988. **Performance Appraisal for Faculty: Implications for Higher Education.** Michigan. The University of Michigan

Borg, W. R. 1987. **Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide for Teachers.** Second Edition. New York: Longman Inc.

Braskamp, L.A, Brandenburg, D.C. and Ory, J.C. 1984. **Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness: A Practical Guide.** California: Sage

Breneman, D.W. and Finney, J.E. 1997. The Changing Landscape: Higher Education Finance in the 1990s" in Callan, O.M. and Finney, J.E. (eds) **Public and Private Financing of Higher Education: Shaping Public Policy for the Future.** Arizona: The Oryx Press

Brink, G.J. and Calitz, L.P. 1994: "Guidelines for designing a model for performance appraisal of lecturers at Technikons". **Pedagogiekjoernaal. 15** (1): 1-12

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. 1989. **Research Methods in Education.** 3rd Edition, New York: Routledge

Department of Education. 1996. **Green Paper on Higher Education Transformation.** Pretoria: Government Printers

Department of Education. 1997. **Higher Education Act, 1997 (Act 101 of 1997).** Pretoria: Government Printers

Dull, L.W. 1981. **Supervision: School Leadership Handbook.** Ohio: Charles Merril Publishing Co.

French, W.L. 1987. **The Personnel Management Process**. 6Th Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

French, W.L. 1990. **Human Resource Management.** Second Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin

Gerber, P.D, Nel, P.S. and Van Dyk, P.S. 1998. **Human Resource Management.** Sixth Edition. Johannesburg: International Thompson Publishing (Pty) Ltd

Klingner, D.E. and Nalbandian, J. 1993. **Public Personnel Management: Contexts and Strategies.** Third Edition. London: Prentice-Hall International Limited

Leedy, P.D. 1997. **Practical Research: Planning and Design.** New York: Macmillan Publishing Company

Loder, C.P.J.(ed). 1990. **Quality Assurance and Accountability in Higher Education**. London: Kogan Page Ltd

Maritz, J. 2000. Department of Statistical Services, University of Stellenbosch. Personal inteview on 23 November

Mouton, J. 1996. **Understanding Social Research.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik Publishers

Neuman, W.L. 1997. **Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.** Boston: Allyn and Bacon

O'Sullivan, E and Rassel, G.R. 1989. **Research Methods for Public Administrators.** New York: Longman

Ramsden, P. 1992. **Learning to Teach in Higher Education.** New York: Routledge

Republic of South Africa. 1995. **Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Act No. 66 of 1995).** Pretoria: Government Printers

Rowland, V. and Birkett, K. 1992. **Personal Effectiveness for Teachers**. Great Britain: Simon and Schuster Education

Seldin, P. 1984. **Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation.** San Francisco; Jossey Bass Inc.

Seldin, P. 1993. **Successful use of Teaching Portfolios.** Bolton: Anker Publishing Company

Simkins, T. 1992. "Policy, Accountability and Management: Perspectives on the Implementation of reform" in Simkins, T, Ellison, E. and Garrett, V. (eds) **Implementing Educational Reform: The Early Lessons.** London: Longman

Stufflebeam, D.L. 1988. **Educational Evaluation**. Boston: Kluwer Academic

Swanepoel, B.J. (ed); Erasmus, B, van Wyk, M.W. and Schenk, H.W. 1998. **South African Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice.** Kenwyn: Juta and Company

Tucker, A. 1984. **Chairing the Academic Department.** New York: Macmillan

Vroeijenstein, A.I. 1995. **Improvement and Accountability: Navigating between Scylla and Charybdis: Guide for External Quality Assessment in Higher Education.** London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

World Bank, 1994. **Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience.** Washington D.C: The World Bank

Dear Participant

QUESTIONNAIRE: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF ACADEMIC STAFF

The attached questionnaire attempts to assess the perception that academic staff and management have of performance appraisal.

Section A contains biographical information. Sections B-F contain statements to which a response is required to a predetermined scale on each page. You are required to indicate your opinion to a statement by marking with a cross the grading that best expresses your viewpoint on the statement.

This project forms part of the requirements for an M Phil: Higher Education. The success of the project depends on a sufficient degree of co-operation by selected respondents. Your co-operation is voluntary, yet it could determine the success of the project. It is for this reason that I appeal to you to take a few minutes of your precious time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me by 12 November 1999. This project enjoys the support of Professor Johan Tromp, our Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic. Please be assured that the information supplied by you will be treated confidentially, and anonymity is guaranteed.

This project could generate information that could be useful to you and our Technikon in attempting to address the challenges facing institutions of higher learning. You will be informed of the findings as soon as my promoter is satisfied with the final product.

Thank you very much for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully

Stan Cronjé
Lecturer: Business Faculty
Phone: 9596508 (w): 9816936 (h): 0822006739

2 November 1999

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Information in this section is needed to enable the researcher to draw a comparison amongst faculties where performance appraisal is formally applied and those where the application is optional. **You are required to mark with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that applies to you.**

A1. Faculty	Business Engineering Science	1 2 3
A2. Position	Lecturer Senior Lecturer Head of Department Associate Dean Dean	1 2 3 4 5
A3.Number of years at Peninsula Technikon	0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21 and more	1 2 3 4 5
A4. Academic qualifications	Matric + 3 Matric + 4 Matric + 5 Matric + 6	1 2 3 4
A5. Gender	Female Male	1 2
A6. Age	Under 25 years 25-40 years 41-55 years 56-years and older	1 2 3 4

B: THE PURPOSE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

This section attempts to uncover the reasons staff think that performance appraisal is necessary and which purposes it should serve. **You are required to mark with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best represents your opinion on the statement on the left.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
B1. Performance appraisal is necessary In my faculty	1	2	3	4	5
B2. Performance appraisal should be used to:					
B2.1. Communicate management objectives to staff	1	2	3	4	5
B2.2. Identify staff training needs	1	2	3	4	5
B2.3. Motivate staff to improve performance	1	2	3	4	5
B2.4. Help management decide on pay increases	1	2	3	4	5
B2.5. Serve as a basis in granting promotion	1	2	3	4	5
B2.6. Guide management in administering the disciplinary procedure	1	2	3	4	5
B2.7. Identify management potential amongst staff	1	2	3	4	5

This section deals with the factors, or job behaviours, that you consider as important in applying performance appraisal. **Please mark with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best represents your opinion on the statement on the left.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly agree
C 1. I consider the following essential for every lecturer:					
C 1. 1. Teaching effectiveness:					
(i) Good pass rates	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Good assessments from students	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Available written materials	1	2	3	4	5
C 1.2. Research:					
(i) Academic qualifications	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Action research	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Publications in scholarly journals	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Delivering papers	1	2	3	4	5
C 1.3. Service delivery:					
(i) Committee work	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Student consultation	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Delivering short courses	1	2	3	4	5
C 1.4. Liaison with industry:					
(i) Course development	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Student experiential learning	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Staff exchange	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Co-operative projects	1	2	3	4	5
C 1.5. Personal qualities:					
(i) Participation	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Creativity	1	2	3	4	5
C 2. Criteria should be explicitly described in the job description	1	2	3	4	5
C 3. Job descriptions should conform to a uniform format at the institution	1	2	3	4	5

This section deals with the sources from which information for performance appraisal should be collected**. <u>You are required to mark with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best indicates your opinion on the statement on the left.</u>**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly agree
D1. Information for performance appraisal should be collected from:					
D1.1. Students:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Personal Qualities	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
D1.2. Colleagues:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
D1.3. Head of Department:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Liaison with industry	1	2	3	4	5
D1.4. Alumni:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Liaison with industry	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
D1.5. Reports on activities kept in the department:					
(i) Committee	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Materials development	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5

E: THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL METHOD

This section deals with the most common methods used for performance appraisal**. Please indicate with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best represents your opinion on the statement on the left.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly agree
E1. My preferred method of appraisal is:					
E1.1. Rating scales (instruments containing statements and performance indicators):					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Liaison with industry	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
E1.2. Written appraisals (written comments to open-ended questions):					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Liaison with industry	1	2	3	4	5
E1.3. Interviews (semi-structured around set criteria):					
(i) Creativity	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Personal development	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Administrative improvements	1	2	3	4	5
E1.4. Tests of achievement:					
(i) Student results	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Student development	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Course development	1	2	3	4	5
E1.5. The Teaching Portfolio (documentation kept by staff member indicating the scope and quality of):					
(i) teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) personal development	1	2	3	4	5

F: THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

This section deals with important steps in managing an appraisal programme. **Please indicate with a cross (X) the number in the column on the right that best indicates your opinion on the statement on the left.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly agree
F1. The programme should start with a meeting between the appraiser and the appraisee to clarify the purpose thereof	1	2	3	4	5
F2. Self-appraisal should be permitted on:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Research	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
F3. Classroom observation must be done on:					
(i) Teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Personal qualities	1	2	3	4	5
F4. There should be an appraisal interview for informing the appraisee of the result	1	2	3	4	5
F5. The appraiser should prepare an appraisal statement to be filed on the appraisee's personal file	1	2	3	4	5
F6. Follow-up meetings should be arranged to monitor progress	1	2	3	4	5
F7. Appraisal should take place:					
(i) Quarterly	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Six-monthly	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Annually	1	2	3	4	5
F8. Special training in performance appraisal should be provided to all appraisers	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you very much for your co-operation.

Appendix B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: INDIVIDUALISED PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR ACADEMIC STAFF

Introduction

This questionnaire serves to elicit some responses from participants pertaining to above in support of the questionnaire that was circulated. The questionnaire does not contain any leading questions regarding the introduction of an individualised performance appraisal system for academic staff.

Participants should be explained about the two major systems mentioned in the literature review, namely the Omnibus system and the Cafeteria system. In essence the former refers to all staff being appraised according to predetermined criteria, whilst the latter provides for a staff member to select, from a number of criteria, those criteria that apply best to the staff member. For example, if the Omnibus system is used and there are 10 criteria, the staff member must be appraised on all 10 criteria. If the Cafeteria system is used, each staff member selects only a maximum of, say, 6.

QUESTION 1
What is your preference of the systems just explained to you?

____

QUESTION 2
What is the reason for your preference?

____

QUESTION 3
Do you not think that allowing staff to choose certain criteria can lead to people being favoured because they only select those criteria that they are good at?

____

____

____

QUESTION 4
Do you think that faculties should have the right to decide for themselves which system to adopt?

____

Thank you very much for your co-operation.